REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanahara et al, for the reasons of record. In response, independent claim 1 is herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied reference for the reasons detailed below.

In the Action, Hanahara is suggested to disclose in Fig. 5 a two-sided light emitting device having two substrates (15, 15A) for light emitted by the first and second light emitting devices.

However, a careful reading of the reference will reveal that the layers 15, 15A are in fact light transmissible insulating layers provided after the light emitting devices are both formed on a single substrate 25, as clearly and expressly taught in paragraph [0027] of the reference.

In the instant disclosure, on the contrary, the two light emitting devices 9, 13 are clearly provided or formed on the two separate substrates 17 and 19, as clearly shown in Fig. 2 and described in the paragraph beginning on line 18 of page 5 of the instant specification.

In order to more particularly and precisely recite this clear and important distinction, independent claim 1 is herewith amended to expressly recite that the first light emitting device is formed on the first substrate, and the second light emitting device is formed on the second substrate. Thus, claim 1, as herewith amended, now more particularly and precisely recites that the term substrate is used in the conventionally-understood manner, namely to denote that layer upon which a device is formed or provided. Clearly, that is not the case in Hanahara, where the two layers suggested in the Action to be substrates are in fact light transmissible insulating layers provided on previously-formed light emitting devices, with the light emitting devices in fact having been previously formed on a single, common substrate 25.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art, accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531

Attorney

(914) 333-9630